

**Summary of Three Public Meetings Regarding the Proposed  
Removal of Private Lands from Tree Farm Licence 23**

**PART ONE: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS**

By Mike Geisler  
Geisler Consulting Inc.

For the Ministry of Forests and Range

Submitted July 2008

**Table of contents for Part One**

Executive summary..... 3  
Background..... 5  
Summary of meeting attendance and number of submissions received ..... 5  
Summary of presentations..... 5  
    David Morel, Executive Director, Ministry of Forests and Range ..... 5  
    Ken Talbot, formally Vice President, Woodlands, Pope and Talbot..... 6  
Summary of comments received..... 8  
    Summary for Revelstoke..... 8  
    Summary for Nakusp ..... 17  
    Summary of Castlegar meeting..... 40  
Summary of key suggestions and recommendations ..... 60  
Outstanding questions..... 61  
Appendix 1: Public Meeting details..... 62

Table 1: Summary of attendance and number of written comments ..... 5  
Table 2: Summary of comments made at the Revelstoke meeting ..... 8  
Table 3: Summary of written comments [Revelstoke] ..... 13  
Table 4: Summary of comments made at the Nakusp Meeting ..... 17  
Table 5: Summary of written comments [Nakusp]..... 26  
Table 6: summary of comments made at the Castlegar Meeting..... 40  
Table 7: Summary of written comments [Castlegar]..... 54

NOTE: PART TWO IS A SEPARATE DOCUMENT AND CONTAINS ALL THE WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED PRIOR TO JUNE 16<sup>TH</sup> 2008.

## Executive summary

- In June 2007 Pope and Talbot formally requested the Minister of Forests and Range remove private land from TFL 23.
- In November 2007 Interfor purchased TFL 23 subject to transfer arrangements and in April 2008 the transfer was completed.
- In May 2008 the Minister asked staff go out to local communities and collect their views on the proposed removal of private land from TFL 23.
- Three public meetings were held. One in each of Revelstoke, Nakusp and Castlegar. The total attendance was 172 and the total number of written submissions was 58.
- The goals of each meeting were to:
  - take advantage of experts attending the meeting to address questions raised during the meeting and
  - record concerns and suggestions from the public
- The audiences were composed of a broad range of people [Local government, Local business, Workers, Contractors, ENGOs, Steelworkers Union, Pulp Workers Union]. No First Nation made themselves known.
- Main point.

The vast majority of input both at meetings and in subsequent written submissions concluded the land should not be removed at this time. However the reason for this position varied

  - Many at the Nakusp meeting said that removal should be conditional on contractors being paid the monies they were owed by Pope and Talbot
  - Many at all meetings said removal only benefits Pope and Talbot's secured creditors
  - Many said removal is not in the best interests of BC nor the local communities. For example removal of these private lands would result in loss of AAC, loss of potential jobs, loss of important environmental and recreation values and likely loss of access to important sites.
  - Many at the Nakusp meeting said removal should be conditional on the pay back of monies ['surety deposits'] put in trust.
  - A few said removal of private land should be conditional on government getting compensation. The funds from the compensation could then be used to assist the communities.
- A small minority said that the lands should be removed from the TFL to promote development, economic diversity and new jobs
- Other notable points made were:
  - The public consultation process was inadequate [short notice, poorly advertised meetings]
  - The private land marketing process was flawed [designed for quick sales of packages made of multiple properties]

- Summary of key suggestions and recommendations
  1. The criteria the Minister should use when considering removal of private land from a TFL are:
    - a. Removal of these private lands must have a real benefit to the people of BC especially the local communities and local industry including
      - i. compensation for decades of net benefit to the TFL holder
      - ii. continued public access to valued sites
      - iii. local economic benefits [for example from less log export]
      - iv. protecting heritage values such as the historic town of Arrowhead
    - b. Removal of these lands must be better for the environment. For example:
      - i. better forest management
      - ii. protection of important wildlife values
      - iii. reducing the carbon footprint
    - c. The original contract must be respected. It made provision for the removal of private land if required for a higher economic use than raising forest crops. However paying US creditors is not a higher economic use.
    - d. There must be adequate process? To date it has been inadequate. For example the general public needs:
      - i. more information
      - ii. more time to react to this proposed removal of private land
      - iii. more time to craft ‘win-win’ deals [for example time to access foundation funds or approach Columbia Basin Trust for purchasing of private lands].
      - iv. a redesigned process to remove bias favoring big developers and put more properties within reach of the general public.
      - v. to review options before they are presented to the Minister
  2. Additional factors the Minister should consider before making his decision on the proposed removal of private land from TFL 23 are:
    - a. Do not remove private lands until the debt owed by Pope and Talbot to local contractors has been paid.
    - b. Do not remove private lands until the monies placed “in trust” with Pope and Talbot [the “surety deposits”] has been returned.
    - c. Do not remove private lands until the poor state of the local economy has been addressed [for example give more land to the Community Forest, use provincial “Community Development Funds” to help Nakusp in these hard times]

## Background

In June 2007 Pope and Talbot submitted a formal request to remove private land from TFL 23. Interfor purchased the TFL without the private lands in November, 2007 subject to the transfer arrangements. The transfer was completed in April 2008. In early May 2008 the Minister of Forest and Range asked staff to collect the views of local communities on the proposed removal.

Three public meetings were advertised in local newspapers and held on May 27<sup>th</sup> in Revelstoke, May 28<sup>th</sup> in Nakusp and May 29<sup>th</sup> in Castlegar. Information fact sheets were made available to all attendees and maps of the private lands were posted in the meeting rooms. In addition to the public meetings, the local public was given the opportunity to comment in writing until June 15<sup>th</sup> 2008.

The agenda for each public meeting can be found in appendix 1.

## Summary of meeting attendance and number of submissions received

**Table 1: Summary of attendance and number of written comments**

	Revelstoke Meeting May 27 2008	Nakusp Meeting. May 28 2008	Castlegar Meeting. May 29 2008	Totals
Attendance at public meeting	17	90	65	172
population of community [BC Stats 2007]	7,600	1,600	7,800	
Number of written submissions *	8	36	14	58

\* see Part Two for copies of all written comments

## Summary of presentations

### David Morel, Executive Director, Ministry of Forests and Range

- Pope and Talbot has asked the Minister to remove certain private lands from TFL 23
- Under the Forest Act the Minister has discretion to decide whether to grant this request. The Minister has not made this decision

- Minister Coleman asked that staff come to communities to collect input about this request
- Brief description of TFLs – area based license to harvest timber
- Objective of the meeting: provide information and seek views tonight, or in writing; views will go to Minister to consider with other information such as the results of the consultation with First Nations, forest management issues, benefits to company
- Pope and Talbot started this process with a written request (see [www.for.gov.bc.ca/rsi/](http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/rsi/) until the end of August 2008 and click on ‘TFL 23 Private Land Removal- public meetings’ for more background information )
- Next Pope and Talbot will describe their request; Ministry of Forests and Range are here to also answer questions.

### **Ken Taylor, formally Vice President, Woodlands, Pope and Talbot**

#### Process/background

- Pre 2007 Pope and Talbot was in financial distress and was looking at a number of options to improve its financial position. Selling of its private lands was one of these options.
- 2007
  - In January and February Pope and Talbot reviewed its private lands to determine if any were not integral to its operations. Pope and Talbot owned 192 properties of which 62 were in TFL 23 [Schedule A Lands]
  - In June
    - Pope and Talbot submitted a formal request to the Minister of Forests and Range requesting the withdrawal of 62 properties [approximately 4,500 ha] of Schedule A Lands from TFL 23.
    - The Ministry of Forests and Range initiated a consultation process with various First Nations.
    - Pope and Talbot signed a Sales Listing Agreement with Colliers International to market about 124 properties including the Schedule A Lands. Pope and Talbot clearly understood the removal of private lands from the TFL required the Minister’s consent.
  - In October Pope and Talbot submitted an Information Package to the Ministry of Forests and Range summarizing the location of lands and resource management issues. This information package is available to the public on the following web site: [www.for.gov.bc.ca/rsi/](http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/rsi/) until the end of August 2008.
  - In November Pope and Talbot organized a conference call to update Mayors and Regional District Directors and answer questions

- 2008
  - Pope and Talbot continues to work with the Ministry of Forests and Range to address concerns in a timely fashion
  - In May Pope and Talbot participated in a series of public meetings organized by the Ministry of Forests and Range.
  - To date about 16 properties outside of the TFL have been sold, agreements have been entered into for several properties inside the TFL but are subject to the Minister's consent to remove them from the TFL and the rest are still for sale.

### Considerations

Pope and Talbot only wanted to sell properties that were not integral to the business. Hence the following were considered

- Allowable Annual Cut [AAC].
  - The estimated reduction to the AAC due to removal of private lands is 0% to 2.5% [0 to 13,000 cubic meters]
- Log Dumps.
  - Log dumps were not part of the properties offered for sale.
- Gravel sources.
  - Gravel sources were either excluded from properties offered for sale or the Purchase and Sales Agreement included a condition that Pope and Talbot or its successor [Interfor] had the right to obtain and use gravel for industrial purposes for 40 to 80 years.
- Statutory Rights of Way.
  - Industrial operations would continue to have access through these private lands.
  - In addition Pope and Talbot agreed to provide for public access through the Oatscott property to provide access to a defunct Indian Reserve on crown land.
- Forest Resource values.
  - Domestic Watersheds, Water Points of Diversion, Wildlife habitat for Ungulates including Caribou, Old Growth Management Areas, Visual Management Areas, Recreation Areas and Permanent Sample Plots were reviewed. The sale of the private lands would likely have minimal impacts on these values. However 3 properties were identified. Two properties within a caribou corridor by Trout lake were deleted from the list proposed to be withdrawn from TFL 23 and part of another property [a 9 ha campsite within the Eagle Bay property] were offered to gift or sell to the Ministry of Forests and Range for one dollar. Once the offer is accepted, the Ministry of Forest and Range will need to do the subdivision.
- Rights of first refusal.
  - All timbered properties proposed for sale included a "right of first refusal" for Pope and Talbot or its successor [Interfor] to purchase timber
- Access and easements.
  - Previous access or easement commitments were included in the Purchase and Sale Agreements.

## Summary of comments received

Note the following summaries for each location include, as separate tables, comments made at the meeting and subsequent written comments

The intent of the summaries was to capture everybody's key statements, questions and suggestions. The meeting summary listed comments in the order they were made so the larger context of the meeting is not lost.

The summary of the written comments is listed in the order the submissions were opened.

## Summary for Revelstoke

**Table 2: Summary of comments made at the Revelstoke meeting**

Key concerns raised or statements made at the Revelstoke meeting.		Suggestions or recommendations	Answers offered at the meeting
	<p><b>Key message at public meeting:</b></p> <p><b>All who spoke did not want the private lands removed from the TFL.</b></p>		
anonymous	<p>When was the TFL established? When were private lands included and what was the trade off at the time</p> <p>What was the incentive for the licensee to include private lands</p>		<p>TFL 23 established in the fall 1955. It was government policy to include private lands. The rationale was to combine lands into one management unit to encourage better forest practices and create security for operators for construction of mills and other infrastructure.</p>



Key concerns raised or statements made at the Revelstoke meeting.	Suggestions or recommendations	Answers offered at the meeting	
		Tax reductions exist for private lands assigned 'managed forest land' status, whether in the TFL or not.	
anonymous	What have been the benefits of including the private lands in the TFL ...for the public ...for the licensee?	<p>In 1955 there wasn't much development in the valley. This TFL was created as many others were to promote development.</p> <p>If there is a benefit, it is the same as for any other privately managed forest land in the province (e.g. Beaumont, woodlots).</p> <p>Public has had access to both private and Crown lands in the TFL, and both were managed in the same way. If held privately outside the TFL, management might be different.</p>	
Loni Parker, Regional District Director	<p>If sold, future use will likely NOT be forestry.</p> <p>Profits from sales will not stay in BC</p>	<p>Minister's decision is only regarding whether to take them out of the TFL. If removed, use will be governed by same laws as other private land.</p> <p>Distribution of proceeds is based on federal bankruptcy laws.</p>	
anonymous	Proceeds from sales will go out of province.	Where the money is going should affect the Minister's decision	The proceeds will go to Pope and Talbot's creditors – secured creditors first.
anonymous	What is the sales process		Process was set up by Colliers International who requested letters of

Key concerns raised or statements made at the Revelstoke meeting.		Suggestions or recommendations	Answers offered at the meeting
			intent; ranked letters; made recommendations to Pope and Talbot as well as to the monitor and courts in some cases. Letters of intent are not binding but the purchase sale agreement is final and binding. Initial agreements are now subject to Minister's decision on Schedule A land removal
anonymous	Sales process not well understood. There was no way to revise initial offer upwards		Offered to discuss more after meeting.
Loni Parker	Talked with Mark Lester – he was clear that Pope and Talbot was looking for a buyer that was able to purchase the largest parcels so sales were clean and simple. So this favoured largest developer. Didn't leave much opportunity for local folks, who didn't even know how the sales were happening. The Minister should be mindful of how the sales process was managed and consider whether this was appropriate from a public perspective.		There are smaller parcels still available
anonymous	Concerned about public consultation process. Seems the process is backwards – agreements have been	Perhaps should start again with this public process and provide opportunity for a proper sales process, including	One sale is to The Land Conservancy (Gilpin area). They asked for 3-4 months more time to bring together the

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Revelstoke meeting.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>	<b>Answers offered at the meeting</b>
	entered into before the public has had a chance to be involved. Calls to conservation lands organizations indicated there wasn't enough time to respond to the sale offers. Thus no opportunity to purchase lands for other values	those interested in a broad range of values.	funds and we agreed to do this  Re: comment that 'It's a done deal.' Minister Coleman has not made up his mind on this decision and has asked us to come out to seek input.
anonymous	Concerned that the level of management or stewardship will be lower on these private lands once sold. [management is better under the TFL]		If removal request is approved by Minister and if sold, then buyer has the opportunity to apply for private forest land status. Then bound by a management plan [which is less constraining than for TFLs].
anonymous	Concerns on disposition and future of Eagle Bay recreation site. Will government get this site? Will government fund the maintenance of this site or will it be closed due to lack of funding		Land will be a sub-divided lot. Ministry of Tourism, Sports and Arts is currently responsible for recreation site management. It will be managed for recreation by some government agency for the long term.
anonymous	Rumors are that Pope and Talbot owes a significant amount of stumpage. Now they are selling these lands and the Crown is owed		Yes, stumpage is payable on the Crown land portion, not on the private land portion. Government did not allow Pope and Talbot to go into stumpage arrears in a large way. [normal process was followed]
anonymous	Process is inadequate. Could have been designed to mitigate some of the current difficulties. Could have used a more methodical approach to engage	Minister has not made a decision. Perhaps it's not too late to fix the process.	Started discussions with regional/provincial Ministry of Forests and Range in May 2007 – we didn't know how to do this so asked them to

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Revelstoke meeting.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>	<b>Answers offered at the meeting</b>
	public, stakeholders, community forests, etc. rather than favouring large national developers. Then there would have been time to cobble together deals that are win-win I am not satisfied with support and leadership that came from government in terms of meeting the public interest		please provide advice. We offered the properties to Ministry of Forests and Range.  The Ministry suggested a call with mayors and we did that.
anonymous	If the Minister doesn't allow the request, what happens to the lands?		They stay in the TFL and can be managed differently, by a different manager.  Interfor was contacted but as of today they have not put in an offer.
Loni Parker	Regarding sale of the TFL to Interfor and the required 5% takeback by the province when a TFL is sold. Where is this going to go?		That legislation no longer exists.
anonymous	How did Pope and Talbot get Schedule A lands?		About 85% granted previous to 1906  Some of the Schedule A lands were Timber Berths [private timber]. This request is only about the private land portion of the Schedule A lands

**Table 3: Summary of written comments [Revelstoke]**

<b>Written comments [Revelstoke] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>
	<b>Key message from written submissions: Do not remove private lands from TFL</b>	
Virginia Thompson	<p>ISSUE 1 Concern about tough times for industry and consequent loss of jobs</p> <p>Concerned that the removal of these lands will have no benefit to the local BC citizens</p> <p>Concerned about missing an important opportunity</p> <p>ISSUE 2 Concerned that the level of stewardship [“less stringent management] will very likely be less than under the TFL.</p>	<p>ISSUE 1 Government should broker, or assist in local forest licensees, particularly community forest companies to take over Schedule A lands.</p> <p>ISSUE 2 Leave these lands in the TFL.</p>
Robin Brook-Hill	<p>These lands have “helped sustain the community”. There is concern that this may disappear if the lands are removed.</p> <p>Concern there is no benefit to the people of BC removing these lands from the TFL</p> <p>The “local ethos will be greatly devalued” if these lands are removed</p>	Strongly opposed to removal of lands from TFL

<b>Written comments [Revelstoke]</b> <b>Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>	<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>
<p>Loni Parker, Regional District Director</p> <p>Companies have benefited from the use of crown land put into TFL It should not be incumbent upon the people of BC to allow Pope and Talbot to sell off the private portion of the TFL for private gain</p> <p>You are likely aware the Revelstoke Community Forest Corporation's TFL is facing its own challenges. Our TFL is in prime caribou habitat and we are experiencing cuts to our AAC. The province has been aware quite some time that the caribou issue needs to be dealt with and if it had dealt with the disposition of the Westar lands differently at the outset the effect on RCFC and our community would have been minimized today</p> <p>The public process so far has provided little information and not enough time to react.</p> <p>There was a desire to sell as many properties to as few people as possible to simplify and speed up the process. This limits the general public's ability to bid and favors big developers.</p>	<p>Opposed to proposed removal of private lands from TFL</p> <p>Please don't make same mistake again.</p> <p>The question of what's in the public interest needs to be asked and that dialogue has not yet happened</p>

<b>Written comments [Revelstoke] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>
	The Official Community Plan does not envision new large resort development in Galena bay or Shelter Bay. There currently are enough challenges dealing with ferry traffic. Any land removed should only be used to accommodate the traveling public for parking, restrooms, telephone and food services.	The public has a vested interest in these lands economically, environmentally and socially. Our communities are very much attached to them and see them as a public resource. We have lost the Columbia River Valley bottom due to Dams for the good of the province. We should not have to lose the foreshores to bail out a failed forest company.
Al Origewitsch, President, Revelstoke ATV club	We in the Revelstoke area have had several roads and trails closed to public access because of change of ownership of private lands. Many local citizens cannot now return to the sites of their home towns. We do not want this to continue	The Revelstoke ATV Club would like to see these roads and trails continue to be accessible to the public in perpetuity or, in the case of development, other routes established to bypass the private land.
Michele Gadbois, President, Arrowhead Conservation Society	We feel that development of this property [Henry Creek] would have a major impact on the habitat values of Arrowhead, the Henry Creek properties and the adjacent crown lands.	The Arrowhead Conservation Society wishes that the Pope and Talbot private property at Henry Creek (DL 7648 and DL 9126) near Arrowhead be protected for its wildlife habitat [Grizzly Bear and Elk] values and not be sold to private interests.  The Arrowhead Conservation Society would be willing to work with the Ministry of Forests and Range, Pope and Talbot and others in the protection

<b>Written comments [Revelstoke] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>
		of these properties for their wildlife habitat values.
anonymous	There are high Grizzly Bear values at Henry Creek. It is also adjacent to the historic town site of Arrowhead.	Henry creek should be acquired by the crown in lieu of some of the debt owing and managed for conservation
Fred Dowdy		These lands should not be sold. These lands should be kept in the TFL
Kathy Burke, President Revelstoke Snowmobile Club	We have learned from experience that access can and has been denied through private land by land owners.  The Revelstoke Snowmobile Club does not wish to interfere with the business of the forest or other industries.	However, we are very concerned that access be maintained through or around these private lands for both industrial and recreational use.



## Summary for Nakusp

**Table 4: Summary of comments made at the Nakusp Meeting**

Key concerns raised or statements made at the Nakusp meeting	Suggestions or recommendations	Answer offered at meeting	
	<p><b>Key message at public meeting:</b></p> <p><b>The vast majority of those who spoke did not want the private lands removed from the TFL.</b></p>		
Mayor Hamling	<p>Concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 600 letters and 700 signature petition did not get to the Minister</li> <li>• Cumulative impacts [past AAC decreases [5%], new set asides for caribou recovery initiative and now private land.]</li> <li>• Debts owed to local contractors but proceeds from sale of private lands will go to the US creditors</li> </ul> <p>Unless funds go directly to local contractors, the mayor can not approve this sale of private lands.</p>	<p>Debts to local contractors should be paid.</p>	<p>Petition and letters have gone to the Minister</p> <p>The 5% take back stayed in the region [no decrease in the Management Unit AAC]</p> <p>The distribution of the proceeds from the sales is governed by the federal Creditors Act and the BC supreme court</p>
Kathy Roberts	Concerned that the money Pope and Talbot owes local contractors won't be paid.	Pope and Talbot should give contractors some of this private land	As per Creditors Act, secured creditors get funds first.
Laurie Page	Concerned that:		There is no predetermined process

Key concerns raised or statements made at the Nakusp meeting		Suggestions or recommendations	Answer offered at meeting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Minister is not working for the people of BC but the US creditors</li> <li>• it took a year to have local consultations</li> <li>• the mayor was not contacted when this meeting was set up</li> </ul>		<p>when a licensee requests the private land be removed from the TFL. The Minister asked staff to come out and collect local input.</p> <p>Apologized to the mayor</p>
Ulrike Zobel, President of local Chamber of Commerce	Concerned that debts to local contractors will not be paid	<p>Find a way to allow profits from sale to be funneled back into the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Minister should make removal on these private lands conditional on paying the local contractors.</li> </ul> <p>Get a legal opinion on whether there is a way in law unsecured creditors can be paid before secured creditors.</p>	This recommendation will be put into the report to the Minister
Doug Brown, local contractor	What happens if the lands are not removed?		<p>The lands stay in the TFL and Pope and Talbot will continue to own them.</p> <p>An Agreement between Pope and Talbot and Interfor states Pope and Talbot would not harvest without Interfor consent and Interfor would not harvest without Pope and</p>

Key concerns raised or statements made at the Nakusp meeting		Suggestions or recommendations	Answer offered at meeting
			Talbot's consent.  The receiver will likely continue to try and sell them [but the value will be lower.
Doug Brown, local contractor	Decision has been made you are wasting our time  The transfer sale shouldn't have gone through until the removal of private land issue was settled.	The lands should not be removed and Interfor should be asked to buy them	Minister has not made a decision and he has asked staff to collect community views before he decides.
anonymous	TFL shouldn't have been transferred then. Timeline here – deal has gone through, Interfor owns TFL. If Ministry of Forests and Range says no to land sale then the transfer shouldn't have gone through until this was settled. You guys are a step behind selling this land.	If Ministry of Forests and Range denies sale of land then Interfor should be made to buy land to stay in the TFL. It is part of the TFL. Interfor should own that land. It only makes sense.	2 issues: 1) license shouldn't have been transferred to Interfor; 2) wasting our time. My view is we are not wasting your time. I personally believe Minister has not made a decision about removing land from TFL and that's why we are here to get your views.
Gordon Haugland, GL&T Logging	Is removal of Schedule A lands a new thing  Also concerned that funds owing the community be paid.		No, requests for removal are not new. The original TFL 23 License contemplates that removal might happen.  However the large amount of land requested for removal is new
Barb Chawaka	Concerned there is no benefit to the	The decision to remove	

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Nakusp meeting</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>	<b>Answer offered at meeting</b>
	community if these lands are sold	private lands should be for a higher purpose than paying off creditors. The decision to remove should benefit the community and the local industry.	
Diana Kelland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was paid for land originally and how much will it be sold for.</li> <li>2. are capital gains due on the increased value</li> </ol>	It is important sociologically that you do not remove lands on the backs of people here.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pope and Talbot paid 28 million for the TFL: including the private lands. The estimate on how much these lands would be sold for if removed from the TFL is 22-26 million</li> <li>2. If there is a requirement for capital gains then it is unlikely that Pope and Talbot would pay anything because there is a net loss.</li> </ol>
Laurie Page	Concerned there is nothing in this potential removal for the people of BC, for the community	Minister should be looking at what is in it for BC. If there is no benefit for citizens what's the point – leave the land inside the TFL.	
Mayor Hamling	Who decides what is economically and		The Minister makes the decision on

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Nakusp meeting</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>	<b>Answer offered at meeting</b>
	socially better...in the short term and in the long term?		removal of private lands from the TFL
Dave Bilinski	Does the Minister have the power to say some of the money from the sale must go to paying off local contractors?  Dave's offer on one piece of property has been accepted and he would like that removed from the TFL. It will be managed as a woodlot.		No. The disbursement is controlled by federal legislation and the BC Supreme Court
Ollie Coates	Ollie does not think that you can own land under SUP that was not paid for.  Also some of this land is under CPR control.		We will look into this
Susan Gustafson, employment councilor	Pope and Talbot looked after the integrity of the business by not including private lands that had log dumps or gravel.	The Minister should look after the integrity of the community...support the people.	
anonymous	Have loggers been paid the security deposit that was put in trust by Pope and Talbot?	The deposit must be paid back and the Minister should be made aware of this unacceptable situation.	No the deposit has not been paid back and not sure where the funds have gone.
anonymous	That is a crime – someone should be put in jail. Is that money being used to keep other parts of Pope and Talbot running?		Don't know where money has gone. Nothing released to date
Ulrike Zobel	What is PricewaterhouseCoopers		We will ask and find out

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Nakusp meeting</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>	<b>Answer offered at meeting</b>
	position on that money?		
anonymous		Ministry of Forests should be ensuring that the money is paid back. Before anything can take place.	
Mayor Hamling		Minister should be aware of this as a separate issue	
Betty Fahlman		The Minister should be looking at the economic wellbeing of the TFL – it belongs to the people. Minister should not be looking at the economic benefits to the TFL holder [Pope and Talbot]	
Aaron Orlando, reporter	Has the report been submitted to the Minister		The Minister has not received a report on this issue. This meeting will be part of the report.
Diana Kelland	Is this occurring in other parts of BC? What was the decision? Was there input from the people in this decision? How would you suggest that the local people here work to have a voice in Ministerial decision? Is there opportunity to see Ministry of Forests and Range report first or have other input?		Private lands have recently been deleted on Vancouver Island but there was no public process.
anonymous	If the contractors are not paid, their	Do not remove lands until	

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Nakusp meeting</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>	<b>Answer offered at meeting</b>
	livelihood is at stake. This removal request is our only ace in the hole to get loggers paid.	debts are paid  Give one piece of land to the community to sell so debts can be paid	
Ulrike Zobel, Chamber of Commerce	Will the report to the Minister contain a recommendation or options? Will the community have an opportunity for input before the report is submitted? Will you make a recommendation to the Minister to get a legal opinion on whether there are ways to get around the creditors act [as currently interpreted]?		The report will likely have options  We will put that request into the report
anonymous	There are lots of reasons to not approve it. What are some of the reasons he would consider to approve it? Not for a higher purpose. What is the reason why he should? He works for people of BC not Pope and Talbot.		
Ulrike Zobel, Chamber of Commerce	Is the Ministry of Forests and Range prepared to commit to getting a legal opinion on getting around the Creditors Act so contractors can be paid?		Will take it to Victoria and get an answer.
Laurie Page	What are some possible options?		We will forward options you come up with through the report.
anonymous	When will you have this report		End of June at earliest
anonymous	When will we know when it is going to go ahead or not? What time frame are		Drop dead date in purchase sale agreement has had two extensions.

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Nakusp meeting</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>	<b>Answer offered at meeting</b>
	you looking at for the offers?		Don't know when it is. Agreements will start to dissolve after that date
Hank Scown	How 'private' is the private land in a TFL if it needs the Minister approval to remove		Private land in a TFL is governed by the Forest Act and the TFL agreement.  There is not much on record around the negotiation of the original agreement.
anonymous	How can it be classified as private land when you need someone else's permission to sell it? Why does Minister have right to rescind or agree with plan?		Private land that is voluntary included in TFL falls under Forest Act. The Act gives the Minister the discretion to remove private land.
anonymous	.	You are acting on behalf of BC. Yes, sell land but make sure people of our country, community are paid back what they are owed. We want you to leave here today thinking that you have done what is right for Nakusp and feel good about the decision. Ministry of Forests and Range has power. Use your power to make the right decision for the people from Nakusp	
Dave Bilinski	May not want a hard solid legal	We may want the Minister to	



<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Nakusp meeting</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>	<b>Answer offered at meeting</b>
	decision. If it goes legal we might not like what we hear.	get the parties to sit down and look at what everyone wants.	
anonymous	Was Interfor offered Schedule A lands? Did they offer to buy Schedule A lands? Could solve the problem if they were offered to Interfor.		No they didn't offer to buy Schedule A lands. They were aware of it but we have not heard back.
Gordon Haugland	When were private lands first taken out of the TFL?	Would be nice if you [government] helped out in these tough times right now.	In the 1950s
Mayor Hamling	When are written comments due?		June 15 <sup>th</sup>
Don Kirk	<p>You pay lower taxes on Managed Forest Land but get to sell at real prices.</p> <p>When Pope and Talbot bought TFL there was a condition to transport logs on the lake for a reasonable price. Is clause still in there? .</p> <p>Is it possible to sue the officers of Pope and Talbot?</p> <p>Was the private land logged proportionately with crown?</p>		<p>That applies regardless of whether it is in a TFL or not</p> <p>Don't think so</p> <p>Yes it was proportionate.</p>

**Table 5: Summary of written comments [Nakusp]**

<b>Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>
<b>In Written submissions</b>		
Laurie Page	Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this consultation.	<p>If these lands are fundamental to a healthy TFL they should not be removed.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the Minister of forests to represent the interests of the people of BC. If there is no clear net benefit to the people of BC then the lands should not be removed.</p> <p>Negotiate “a benefit” to the citizens of BC as a condition before the lands are removed from the TFL. The following two options to provide a benefit should go into the report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. require that a fund be set up to pay contractors the moneys they are owed</li> <li>2. Set aside half of the private land to be managed as a community forest. Could also increase the size of Nakusp’s community forest.</li> </ol> <p>Pope and Talbot does not deserve any kind of bail out. The deposit paid by contractors has not been paid back. Also the contractors need to be paid the money’s owed them.</p>
No name provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The highest and best use of these lands is</li> </ul>	

<b>Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>
	<p>for something other than forest management and logging. The whole area is crying for more development and an increase tax base,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This person would like to see the local contractors paid.</li> </ul>	
Susan Gustafson, Employment Counselor/supervisor, Arrow and Slocan Lakes Community Services	Nakusp has been devastated by the economic downturn	The Minister could help Nakusp by designating a portion of the Community Development Funds for Nakusp as he has done for Mackenzie and Ft St James.
Terry and Jo-anne Martin, T. Martin Trucking	<p>Do not remove private lands for the following reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) None of the money received by Pricewaterhouse will go toward any debts incurred by Pope &amp; Talbot to residents/companies in British Columbia.</li> <li>2) Although, we personally have \$25000+ in lost income and incurred expenses from work completed but not paid by Pope &amp; Talbot when they went into receivership, we do not want that money at the expense of the lands being removed and sold off.</li> <li>3) The removal and sale of this land will not benefit Pope &amp; Talbot now as it may have when they first applied before declaring bankruptcy.</li> <li>4) Pope &amp; Talbot has not been held accountable for criminal behavior regarding the sureties local contractors paid for their contracts. These sureties</li> </ol>	Do not remove private lands

Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.	Suggestions or recommendations
<p>were to be held in trust by Pope and Talbot and returned when the contracts were dissolved. The courts of BC overturned the validity of these contracts with the sale of the TFL to Interfor.</p> <p>5) The TFL should not have been allowed to be sold to Interfor by the Ministry of Forests as the TFL is crown land that belongs to the people of BC and when Pope &amp; Talbot defaulted on their ability to manage it and themselves, management should have reverted to the people and their Ministry of Forests.</p> <p>6) It is stated that Schedule A land may be removed from a TFL if it were to serve a 'higher purpose' than forestry. Allowing the removal of this land to pay off debts to a bank in the United States is NOT a higher purpose.</p> <p>7) The removal of this land will affect the integrity and future of the TFL 23 and the communities dependent on it.</p> <p>8) Removal and selling of this land for development will not benefit this valley as any employment, etc., will be in the very distant future and this is not what attracts the tourists, summer residents and the year-round residents to this area. It is extremely unfair for someone in Victoria to assume what is best for this valley. We're told that "the Liberal Government feels any development is good development." We would like to believe this isn't the case. The course and pace of any</p>	

Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.	Suggestions or recommendations
<p>development has to be sensitive to the needs of the environment and residents in that area as it varies greatly from place to place.</p> <p>9) Unlike forestry, development is not a renewable resource.</p> <p>10) Mr. Rich Coleman is an elected official, elected by the people of British Columbia. Therefore, his decisions should be based on the needs and desires of those people as well as the benefits his decisions would be to British Columbia. To allow this removal of land from a TFL would be of benefit to the American secured creditors of Pope &amp; Talbot only.</p>	
<p>Crystal Volansky</p> <p><i>First letter:</i> These lands are an asset to our province, selling these lands without compensation to British Columbia and having past debts not paid to the local people is a total disregard to the economic future of our forestry industry.</p> <p>Many of these contractors have also placed money in trust with Pope &amp; Talbot, receiving interest on that money each year and now that money has disappeared, how can this money just disappear?</p> <p><i>Second letter:</i> If the sales agreement does not include the lands then the land would and should belong to the crown, as Pope &amp; Talbot is in receivership. Why</p>	<p><i>In the first letter and second letter:</i> Please consider the local people and the future of our forestry industry before considering a large corporation from the United States and its secured creditors from New York.</p>

Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.	Suggestions or recommendations	
	<p>is the crown not taking this land back? Why was Pope &amp; Talbot allowed to sell the license without the Schedule A land?</p> <p>Can you ensure that the economic benefit of this land in the future will always be more valuable in real estate rather than in the forestry industry?</p>	
<p>Len Surina, President, Arrow Lakes Logging</p>	<p>The tenure agreement says Schedule A lands would be allowed for release from TFL 23 if there was a better economic use for those lands. Selling these lands for development is not a better economic use.</p> <p>There has been no consideration given the contractors that had replaceable contracts with Pope &amp; Talbot Ltd. Contractors will get no benefit from this sale and are owed in the millions of dollars!</p> <p>Costs associated with the Interfor purchase agreement are well documented. All Canadian invoices listed there are directly linked to work done in TFL 23</p>	<p>Please be compelled to consider the people of British Columbia over the self serving request of a company.</p> <p>Although I don't agree with the sale of Schedule A lands, in the event of that happening, the Minister should insist those invoices be paid first upon the release and sale of Schedule A lands!</p>
<p>Barb Chevaihla</p>	<p>The “higher economic purpose” for these Schedule A lands is NOT to pay off a debt of a company who did not manage their business responsibly.</p>	
<p>Richard Fahlman,</p>	<p>This year because of the bankruptcy of Pope and</p>	<p>Consideration on the removal of these lands</p>

<b>Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>
Maybe Trucking	<p>Talbot I've had to take a logging truck to the auction in order to get some money to survive</p> <p>If and when developed, I know from thirty years experience, working within TFL 23, it will put more negative pressure on the logging industry when the new residents complain about the visuals of cut blocks, the noise of logging trucks and other logging equipment.</p>	<p>from TFL 23 should focus on the long term economic benefit of TFL 23, which belongs to BCers, not the benefit of a bankrupt licensee holder.</p> <p>If you do decide to release these lands, all should be done and more to direct the money to the local contractors who were left with huge debts.</p>
Betty and Richard Fahlman	<p>We are against the removal of private lands from TFL 23 because we foresee that future development of these prime wooded waterfront lands will further negatively impact the logging industry in this area for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- These areas do not fall within village bylaw areas - Control of development falls to Regional Districts or who?</li> <li>- New residents will be complaining about the visuals of cut blocks as well as the noise and traffic logging generates.</li> <li>-The AAC will be reduced yet again - more loss of work in a TFL that is one of the richest in tree diversity.</li> <li>-It is our belief that cancelling of the agreement to ship logs via the lake was done with the</li> </ul>	

Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.	Suggestions or recommendations	
	foresight of selling these lands - making the log dumps defunct.	
Tammy O'Brian, Business owner and resident, Nakusp	<p>The BC Government is supposed to be looking out for the people of the province they were elected by, and that is clearly not happening.</p> <p>The money that the contractors had to put up as security is a substantial amount, and there is absolutely no excuse for those monies to not be returned. Add that onto the significant costs incurred to produce the work that they never got paid for is insane!!!</p> <p>The bloody banks can wait their turn. If they were foolish enough to lend to an insolvent company then they can take their lumps. They had the choice, we did not.</p>	Our government ( or lack of at this point in time ) has got to take a stand and do what is right
Cliff Woffenden		The Minister should not allow these lands to be sold, but if is, it should stipulate that the contractors get their share before the money is allowed to leave the country.
Stephen Marks, Business owner, Nakusp	<p><a href="http://www.dogwoodinitiative.org/documents/tfl-deletions/Audit_Request_Letter-2004-memo-highlights.pdf">http://www.dogwoodinitiative.org/documents/tfl-deletions/Audit_Request_Letter-2004-memo-highlights.pdf</a>.</p> <p>I believe once you review the above document (and maybe you have) that you would agree with this statement. "The sale of the private lands attached to the TFL should be allowed to proceed</p>	I would like to state that I am strongly opposed to the removal of these lands without compensation to our contractors or people who are owed monies that were directly affected by the Bankruptcy of Pope & Talbot Inc.



<b>Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>	<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>	
	once Pope and Talbot agrees to provide the "appropriate consideration" determined above to government".	
Jennifer Cliff-Marks, Literacy Coordinator	Our community has faced so much hardship over the years, and the sale of these lands would be another blow.	We are all counting on your group and our Minister of Forests to do the right thing for us in the Nakusp area.
Craig Besinque, New Denver	Let me get this straight: The BC Ministry of Forests is considering allowing a foreign corporation (Pope & Talbot, of Portland Oregon) to sell BC land taken out of the TFL, to raise money to pay foreign creditors, when local creditors (contractors who were actually doing the logging work for Pope & Talbot) are NOT going to be paid.	I see no benefit to British Columbians in this course of action. I see NO good reason for the Ministry to approve such a sale.
Doug McQuair. Logging contractor	<p>We as contractors were told that our \$25,000 security bond would be put in trust to protect us (or the company) in case of some environmental disaster or other problem. We were told that our contract had a clause that should Pope and Talbot become insolvent or bankrupt that the TFL would go back to the crown. We as contractors were under the impression that our ever green contracts were a part of the TFL #23.</p> <p>The contractors in our valley gave up a lot of things to help Pope and Talbot through their tough times. Now too have the accountants and lawyers just cast us off like some useless piece of garbage really hurts. The judge in the case sounded like he</p>	<p>I feel very strongly that these matters need to be investigated before Pope and Talbot is given the approval to sell any of OUR land!</p> <p>I believe that the money made from the sale of the private lands would be a good thing if the money was first used to pay the debts of the local people directly affected by Pope and Talbot's failure. If the moneys are only to pay off the banks then I am very much against removing any more lands from TFL#23.</p>

<b>Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>
	<p>cared about the well fare of the people of the valley, then in a shocking move he too cast us off without a penny in compensation for our efforts. I am positive that someone moved our security money into general revenue and someone planned to let us work for a month and then not pay us.</p> <p>Due to lack of any help by our government I am losing every thing. My plan was to sell off some of my equipment to pay my debts, but the equipment is now selling for only cents on the dollar. Any kind of compensation from the Pope and Talbot sale would help to keep my company alive until the markets turn around.</p>	
anonymous	.	The private lands should be transferred to the crown as partial payments of debt owing the province from TFL23. These lands should then be managed for wildlife values, parks or local woodlots
Greenpeaks Holidays Ltd		The people of BC who are left owed monies should be paid before paying creditors out of province.
anonymous		Pay creditors in BC before the USA
Bryon ???		These lands should remain as public commercial forest resources
Thiessen	People's land not private	
Cathy Robert's	What do the people of BC get from this sale?	Find a legal way to ensure monies from sale is used in part to pay the loggers who are

<b>Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>
		owed large amounts.
Ruth Klughammer	<p>The areas surrounding Nakusp need economic development to create jobs. This area has fantastic potential for economic development, not just for harvesting timber</p> <p>Does it make good business sense to turn over some private lands for a community forest?</p> <p>I am not an expert in how TFLs work but it seems that large TFLs encourage monopolies and I not in favor of that.</p>	
Henry Scown	Private land put into the TFL is no longer fee simple private land because of the ‘partnership with the people of BC’ created with the TFL	Please negotiate with the Receiver, Pope and Talbot, Wells Fargo...whomever to do the right thing and pay the outstanding debts owed [locally]
Richard Eichenauer		<p>The monies contractors paid in trust are not Pope and Talbot assets and should not be lumped into the bankruptcy settlements</p> <p>In addition many contractors are owed wages and payments for work done. These must be paid back before shareholders and banks are paid. [These contractors have to move to new homes elsewhere to find work.]</p>
Helmut Klughammer	Construction on these smaller parcels could help	The private land should be sold and the

Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.		Suggestions or recommendations
	<p>offset the forestry dependant jobs.</p> <p>To keep this private land in the TFL will once again give a large company a monopoly and once again we become a one company town</p>	<p>proceeds go to the contractors who are owed.</p> <p>The large parcels should be sold in smaller parcels so locals can bid on them</p>
Milt Parent	<p>What gave the valley a huge employment base [the TFL] has eroded into chaos where chip trucks go by ruining our roads and provide no employment. Such disregard for all the TFL operators is disgusting.</p>	
Rosemanie Parent	<p>I am appalled at what the government plans to do to help Pope and Talbot with their bankruptcy. What about our future? Selling off this private land is a crime</p>	<p>Something should be done to help us in this time of need.</p>
Dorothy Drebet	<p>Pope and Talbot has every right to sell as it sees fit under the law</p> <p>People here have a lot of misinformation</p>	<p>Withdrawal of these lands should be allowed to go through</p>
Jesper Nielsen, RPF	<p><a href="http://www.dogwoodinitiative.org/documents/tfl-deletions/Audit_Request_Letter-2004-memo-highlights.pdf">http://www.dogwoodinitiative.org/documents/tfl-deletions/Audit_Request_Letter-2004-memo-highlights.pdf</a></p> <p>The document found on the above website implies government has the right to ask for compensation for private lands removed from TFLs.</p>	<p>The sale of the private lands should be allowed to proceed once Pope and Talbot agrees to provide appropriate compensation</p> <p>If government asks for compensation and Pope and Talbot can not deliver, then the Minister should refuse to remove the private lands.</p> <p>Compensation should go to the citizens in accordance with how adversely they were</p>

<b>Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>
		affected by the breaking of the social contract with the landowner [the people of upper Arrow lakes would be at the top of the list]
Mayor Hamling	It was brought to the attention of those present that the local contractors have not received their security deposits back. The community feels that this holding back of security deposits would be considered as theft.	<p>The community is requesting that the government's legal team review and see if there are any loopholes so that this land could be sold to return the \$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000 owed to the contractors</p> <p>Removal of private lands must have a socioeconomic benefit to the people of this community and area. No one has been able to identify one as yet</p> <p>We want to see options given to the minister and have the ability to give input into the options at the next level.</p>
Beth McLeod		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Funds from logging contractors that were supposedly held in trust should be returned to the contractors</li> <li>b. Lawyers should look for a way to have some of the proceeds of a potential sale go to the local contractors who are owed money.</li> <li>c. The Minister's decision should be based on the benefit to the people of our region and the rest of BC.</li> <li>d. The community should have a</li> </ol>

Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.		Suggestions or recommendations
		chance to see your report with suggested options before it goes to the Minister.
Meadow Creek Contracting Ltd.  Larry Cameron Laurie Cameron Gary Larder Crystal Larder Terry Cameron Dawn Cameron	This company is owed large sums of money [hundreds of thousands of dollars] by Pope and Talbot [via contract and the surety deposit]  The document on the following website suggests compensation is due the people of BC <a href="http://www.dogwoodinitiative.org/documents/tfl-deletions/Audit_Request_Letter-2004-memo-highlights.pdf">http://www.dogwoodinitiative.org/documents/tfl-deletions/Audit_Request_Letter-2004-memo-highlights.pdf</a>  We feel strongly that the judgment that allowed Interfor to purchase TFL 23 without consultation with the communities involved was reprehensible. Interfor have shown no intention of providing employment anytime soon and have indicated that once they resume operations the local contractors are NOT guaranteed to obtain the work offered.	The government of BC should investigate and if necessary press charges if the deposit is not returned.  The people and local communities of BC should be compensated first for their losses.  The Federal courts failed us in that matter and we implore the Provincial government to do what they can now to repair some of the damage done.
Ieneke van Houten	What's in this sale for the citizens of the local area? Not much it seems	Do not remove this private land from the TFL. This TFL needs to be managed with an eye to the future of the hard working citizens of the valley...the people who built Nakusp.
Ronald Volansky, President, R&A Logging	<i>First letter</i> It appears the provincial government has recognized that compensation may be due when	Government should set up a special compensation trust fund for affected contractors and their employees, with the

<b>Written comments [Nakusp] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Suggestions or recommendations</b>
	<p>private lands are removed and sold.</p> <p><i>Second letter</i> Apparently the tenure agreement says Schedule A lands would be allowed for release from TFL 23 if there was a better economic use for those lands. Removal and sale of these lands will provide little or no economic benefit to the people of BC.</p>	<p>specific recognition that the trust will be funded by Pope &amp; Talbot Ltd's compensatory payments</p> <p>Please be compelled to consider the people of British Columbia over the self-serving request of a mismanaged US company.</p>
John Drehet	It is very important that rules regarding private property remain the same.	The owner of the private land in the TFL should be able to have these lands removed if they request it
Carey Vanderkroft	No way	

## Summary of Castlegar meeting

**Table 6: summary of comments made at the Castlegar Meeting**

Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.	Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made	Answers offered at meeting
	<p><b>Key message at public meeting:</b></p> <p><b>[By applause] the vast majority of the audience did not want the private lands removed from the TFL.</b></p>	
	<p>There was some concern just as the meeting started about lack of advertisement [the notice did not get in to the local Castlegar paper until the day before the meeting] and there was a suggestion that the meeting be rescheduled.</p>	
Sandy Korman	<p>The TFL does not belong to Pope and Talbot and the public does not want these private lands to be sold</p> <p>The \$40 million from the sale of these properties will not be put back in our area</p>	<p>We will put what we hear tonight in a report to the Minister.</p> <p>Distribution of the proceeds of the sale is governed by federal law. Secured creditors will be paid first [finance companies in New York]</p>
Gordon Zaitsoff, Regional District Director	<p>Pope and Talbot considerations to keep properties integral to the business is small potatoes</p>	



Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.		Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made	Answers offered at meeting
	<p>compared to the big picture.</p> <p>If the Minister declines to allow removal what happens to offers currently in place?</p> <p>The lands are parcels of crown land and don't belong to Pope and Talbot. Pope and Talbot was negligent so why are they rewarded with sale of properties</p>	<p>They should stay intact and stay with TFL for future generations.</p>	<p>Purchase agreements are null and void on Sept 30, 2008.</p>
Keith Simmons	<p>Long term viability [of local mills] is not made better with removal of lands from fiber basket</p> <p>No taxes paid so are taxes going to be paid back?</p>	<p>Land expropriated by BC Hydro, should stay our land and certainly should not be sold to people from outside the community.</p>	<p>The Ministry of Forests and Range looked at land titles and found no reference to BC Hydro or the expropriation. None of the BC Hydro expropriated land was the Schedule A land. Lands were crown granted around turn of century and attached to TFL in 1955 as private land that will be managed the same as crown land in the TFL.</p>
anonymous	<p>Have Pope and Talbot paid taxes on private land?</p>		<p>Pope and Talbot paid all required taxes on private land</p>
anonymous	<p>Timber West took land out of public land base with no public</p>	<p>The Minister should not let the land out of the TFL. That way it will stop</p>	

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.</b>		<b>Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made</b>	<b>Answers offered at meeting</b>
	consultation. We brought the meetings here so we should tell Minister to keep land in TFL to have for our future.	the sale to developers and it will remain land managed for timber.	
anonymous	Fail to see how sales of land will benefit anyone in BC or Canada. Only benefit is to bankers in US not working class people of BC.		
Kristy Magaton	How will planning be affected if the Schedule A land is removed? Less AAC – more constraints – this will have serious long term impacts locally. Will the Minister consider that?  Why wasn't there public consultation in April 2007 when application was first received?	If Minister is considering comments where is he? He should be here.	If Schedule A land is removed it will put additional constraints on remaining crown land.  Yes the Minister will consider that  The Minister asked us on May 6 <sup>th</sup> to conduct these public meetings
anonymous	How much is owed to secure creditors?		\$245 million
Don McMullen	Process is an affront to people of BC. Process is a joke. Sorry that government would allow a piece of Canada to be taken away from future generations to settle a court takeover.  What obligation does the province have to reduce liability		Province has no obligation to reduce liability – Ministry of Forests and

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.</b>		<b>Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made</b>	<b>Answers offered at meeting</b>
	<p>in a private sector dispute?</p> <p>Has beetle kill timber been taken into consideration (calculations)?</p> <p>Who owned the fee simple land in 1955?</p>		<p>Range's obligation is to respond to the application to remove Schedule A lands from TFL.</p> <p>Less than 5% of the timber inventory is lodgepole pine in TFL 23 timber profile. Beetle kill issue doesn't pose threat to the TFL AAC.</p> <p>In 1955, private lands included in TFL was owned by whoever had the TFL at that time – probably Canadian Cellulose</p>
<p>Stan McMaster, President, Local Steelworkers Union</p>	<p>Steelworkers are totally against removal of private lands from TFL</p> <p>Companies have already received special tax rates and received millions in revenues from these lands. Removal will result in more benefits – no stumpage, no forest act regs or export regulation, right to restrict public access and can sell lands for real estate prices. Privately held lands are not truly privately held if you</p>		<p>Re Stumpage. There is no requirement to pay stumpage on private land. It does not matter if it is in a TFL or outside a TFL.</p>

Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.	Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made	Answers offered at meeting
<p>have to go to the Minister to ask for removal.</p> <p>Lands put up for sale have a disclaimer saying sales are dependant on removal from TFL. Pope and Talbot affidavit to bankruptcy courts never stated that - said Pope and Talbot is in process of selling land. Only disclaimer on Colliers website stated that Pope and Talbot has right to withdraw lands from sale.</p> <p>Minister said (October) Pope and Talbot can't sell it if it isn't outside of TFL and it isn't helpful to put it up for sale during approval process. After this much time (original application Feb 2007) are these public meetings smoke and mirrors to try to buffalo public to make it seem like he is doing something?</p> <p>Why didn't Pope and Talbot state in affidavit to bankruptcy court that sales are subject to removal from TFL?</p>		<p>Pope and Talbot was and is aware that Schedule A land couldn't be removed without the minister approval and they are following the</p>

Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.	Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made	Answers offered at meeting
<p>anonymous</p> <p>How did companies acquire the private land? Did they buy it or was it given to them?</p> <p>How many were purchased?</p>		<p>required process.</p> <p>Do not know details on how each was acquired initially. Each individual parcel has different history and was acquired for different reasons. Some acquired in 1960s like Mennonite Flats which was bought for the market price of the day. Others came with sawmills. For example the developer who was proposing the TFL bought up small sawmills in area. Many of these sawmills came with parcels of private property.</p> <p>65 parcels were in the application. Little bits and pieces bought over time. Some put in TFL and some weren't.</p>
<p>Kristy Magaton</p>	<p>Regarding highest and best use possible of the land. One time sale of two to three thousand dollars per hectare is not the highest and best use. Forestry and agriculture is a better price per hectare in perpetuity. Selling one time offer is not highest and best use possible for land. Minister needs to know</p>	

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.</b>		<b>Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made</b>	<b>Answers offered at meeting</b>
anonymous	<p>How will this benefit people of community and what compensation will these people see?</p> <p>Proceeds from sales go to primary creditors. What proportion of proceeds would the government consider having to take back and give to people.</p> <p>Will you be considering compensation for past benefits?</p>		<p>The people of BC did receive benefits from including private land in a TFL. A pulp mill was built [employment] and private land was put back into forest management [higher AAC] for many years.</p> <p>The specific decision the Minister will make is ‘should land be deleted or not?’</p> <p>Not sure where compensation question is coming from? We can discuss more after the meeting.</p>
Ken Wylie, former Regional District Director	<p>Process is dog and pony show. Long term impacts can’t be assessed by this process. Difficult to respond. Everyone here thinks it’s a done deal.</p> <p>The Company that has mismanaged - has lost 3 mills and is now tinkering with TFL.</p> <p>The TFL has sustained community for years. Families have been destroyed by Pope and Talbot mismanagement.</p>	<p>Tell Minister to not go along with plan to remove private land.</p> <p>Columbia Basin Trust could buy and manage this land</p>	
anonymous	Pope and Talbot applied to have		

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.</b>		<b>Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made</b>	<b>Answers offered at meeting</b>
	<p>the land removed before bankruptcy so it looks like they wanted to take the money and run before bankruptcy proceedings. New owners of Celgar Pulp and local community began to put pressure on for compensation. What are we going to get out of this? If the Minister has his mind already made up a year ago how do we get through to Minister that we want land to stay under TFL?</p>		<p>Do what you are doing now plus submit written comments.</p>
<p>anonymous</p>	<p>How is sale of these private lands going to benefit local businesses and local people?</p> <p>Have studies been done?</p> <p>Is there denial of public access?</p> <p>Will public be losing access if the land is sold?</p>		<p>Under TFL agreement access must be provided for forest service personnel / forest management and third party industrial use. No requirement to grant access to public.</p> <p>Pope and Talbot have never restricted public access</p> <p>Depends on new owner if sold.</p>

Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.	Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made	Answers offered at meeting
anonymous	Withdrawal of land may or may not have impact on AAC. When is the Timber Supply Review due?	Sept 2009
anonymous	<p>This is a poorly set up public hearing. No standing microphone. Body language is uncomfortable. Notice wasn't sent into paper in time.</p> <p>Isn't it a conflict of interest for employees of Ministry of Forests and Range to have options on land (can they buy land)?</p>	<p>Yes, it is uncomfortable up here.</p> <p>There is an implication that government staff is dishonest. You can say what you want about forest policy or what the Minister or politicians should do but staff does not deserve that implication. In fact the opposite is true.</p>
anonymous	Is Pope and Talbot a private company and are directors not responsible for their own debt?	<p>Company still exists but directors and officers no longer running the company. The company through the receivers is being guided by BC Supreme Court.</p> <p>PricewaterhouseCoopers is selling assets trying to discharge debt.</p> <p>We believe there are claims related to company operations against directors and officers.</p>
Kristy Magaton	Under a TFL the lands are being managed sustainably. If land is	Don't disagree there is an issue. Please put on paper so Minister can



Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.	Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made	Answers offered at meeting
	sold how will Minister ensure that it is being managed sustainably? [e.g. the carbon footprint]	consider those issues.  If the lands are removed the rules that apply will be the same as for our private land outside of TFLs.
anonymous	Who are companies that have put bids in on Schedule A land?	Don't have that information here
anonymous	If lands are not removed from TFL and sold are they in the creditor's name? Can creditors sell them or does process start over again?	Pope and Talbot is still a corporate entity. PricewaterhouseCoopers has right to sell land. As long as lands are in Pope and Talbot's name PricewaterhouseCoopers will continue to try and sell them. Land is not assigned to the creditor  Outside of the TFL private lands have higher value. They still have a value in the TFL but it is less.
anonymous	Will Minister make deals transparent so that we know what will be happening with land and who buys it?	The courts have to approve each sale so info about who is buying land is available.
anonymous	How do we ensure that there is no conflict of interest? Maybe the Ministry of Forests and Range is in on these deals – people think there is a fix going on.	PricewaterhouseCoopers' website has this info

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.</b>		<b>Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made</b>	<b>Answers offered at meeting</b>
anonymous	If the Ministry of Forests and Range decides that land will be sold, has the government thought about buying it back for people of BC where it belongs? BC land – it should stay here.		Decision is whether it is in or out of TLF. The Ministry isn't in business of buying land. The Ministry of Forests and Range is only looking at the decision to keep it in the TFL or not.
anonymous	If this does not go through and land stays in TFL, does it stay in TFL at lower rate?		The land stays in TFL and remains as 'managed forest land'
anonymous	If Pope and Talbot doesn't exist who will inherit the land? Elected officials brought land together in 1950s for better forest management – now government wants to sell it. Now they think it is a bad idea. What do you as an elected official think of this?		We are not elected officials. We are only collecting information as an employee of the Ministry of Forests and Range.
Richard Switzer	US creditors through NAFTA force sale of lands to satisfy creditors' demands against our wishes. We are dealing with a US problem of US company that has mismanaged and we are paying price.		Chapter 11 and NAFTA. Don't think there is a right for expropriation for refusing to keep lands in or out of TFL. Two pending NAFTA cases from American companies.
	Removing 4400 hectares of Canadian land worth millions and giving it away. This should go through a public hearing process. You people are not qualified,		We were asked to go to local communities and do some public consultations.

Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.		Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made	Answers offered at meeting
	<p>can't give direct answers, as you don't know. We would get formal presentations from experts if carried out as proper formal public hearing. Why hasn't there been a public hearing?</p>		
anonymous	<p>The Company has received benefits for operating on TFL for 50 years. Land may not have greater value in real estate. This is just a windfall for company. Deleting lands with out compensation is inconsistent with management of resources in public interest. What is the true value of the property?</p>		
anonymous	<p>Is there a legal agreement to prevent Minister from making decision thereby impacting the value of land and reducing the amount of money creditors are going to get?</p> <p>Can creditors petition the court if Minister reduces value of land under removal?</p> <p>Is there anywhere in BC where TFL in BC has more than one</p>		<p>not aware of one</p> <p>You can petition the court – available to anybody.</p> <p>Yes, there is a license where the licensee is not the same as the private land owner.</p>

Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.		Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made	Answers offered at meeting
	land owner?		Under the purchase agreement Pope and Talbot does not have right to harvest on Schedule A land without Interfor agreement and Interfor has to provide consent and vice versa. Must be a mutual agreement.
Steve Miros, Pulp Workers Union of Canada, Environmental Chair	Local and national members oppose sale. Is it a political decision? What is basis behind it? Where are you coming from? How are lands separated from TFL? They should have gone (sold) with TFL. Is it a political decision or is it based on a sound forest business decision?	Legal separation? Interfor owns TFL license. Schedule A should have gone with sale	Minister has unconstrained discretion. There are no criteria in Forest Act.  Fiber supply is an issue. Minister needs to know about impacts to fiber. We don't know what the outcome will be if the land comes out and is sold. It could go back to private land forestry.  Ministry of Forests and Range staff has been looking at effects to forest management impacts.  Interfor owns the license but not the crown land. Schedule A is private land.
anonymous	When Westar owned TFL what was status of Schedule A land		Same as now. License didn't change.

<b>Key concerns raised or statements made at the Castlegar meeting.</b>		<b>Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made</b>	<b>Answers offered at meeting</b>
	under that regime?		Schedule A and Schedule B lands in TFL. The agreement ensures they will be managed together... in exchange for mutual benefits.
anonymous	(Read statement regarding deleting privately held land deleted from TFL 39 and TFL 44 in 2004. Buying out contracts?)		
anonymous	What is mutual benefit now that Pope and Talbot isn't in picture? Where is benefit in selling Schedule A land? Who benefits other than creditors? Can't see benefit of releasing land from TFL.		
anonymous	This meeting is our lifeline to the Minister. This meeting wasn't properly advertised, there would have been more people at meeting if they had known about it.		
Manuel Freitas	I'm totally against the sale as it is crown land shouldn't be release as private land for sale. In 10 -15 years we will be in the same place as now if land is released. Sets bad precedent.		

**Table 7: Summary of written comments [Castlegar]**

<b>Written comments [Castlegar] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made</b>
<b>Written comments</b>		
Stan McMaster, president United Steelworkers Union local 1-405	<p>The Steelworkers are totally opposed to the removal of private land from the TFL 23.</p> <p>The Union is concerned the Minister has already decided and this public session is just “smoke and mirrors”. Articles in the papers, the affidavit, descriptions on Colliers web site all suggest the lands would be removed. What was the real nature of discussion between Pope and Talbot, Ministry of Forests and Range staff and the Minister</p>	TFLs were never created for purposes of real-estate sales and should not be sold off for that purpose or any purpose other than the purpose they were created for, which is timber harvesting and supply timber to manufacturing facilities.
Tony Parece	Those lands should stay in the TFL where they belong for the future of our industry and the citizens and communities that depend on that land.	The Minister and the premier should resign.
Sandy Korman	Selling private lands only benefits Pope and Talbot and their creditors.	This does not benefit the workers or the crown and therefore should not happen.
Ken Wylie	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Process is flawed. Not adequately notified and information inadequate</li> <li>2. These lands are integral to TFL 23</li> <li>3. Removing these lands will result in profiteering and unplanned and uncontrolled development.</li> </ol>	Pursue public purchase through Columbia Basin Trust funding
Steve Miros, Pulp Workers Union of Canada, Environmental	Selling these parcels of land off simply for profit and no insight into the future sustainability of our forest industry, communities and province is unacceptable. In fact the sale would be deleterious, as potential raw log exports from	The membership of the Pulp Paper and Woodworkers of Canada is strongly opposed to the withdrawal and sale of Pope & Talbot private lands from TFL 23.

Written comments [Castlegar] Key concerns raised or statements made.	Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made
<p>Chair</p> <p>these “private ” tracts of land would further jeopardize local forest industry issues</p> <p>In the past the Crown obtained compensation for deletions of private land from TFLs, and the failure to obtain such compensation in this case would appear to be contrary to important public interests.</p> <p>Issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undermining the integrity of public lands in the TFL. An example being loss of access to log sorts and scales on the Upper Arrow Lake</li> <li>• Economic loss suffered because of government’s failure to recover compensation for the decades of substantial benefits that have accrued to the TFL holder (and its corporate predecessors), and will continue to accrue</li> <li>• The public’s interest in environmental protection and public recreation that will be compromised because the deletion removes environmental and social protections available under the <i>Forest and Range Practices Act</i> and various other laws and policies. For example regulations that restrict logging in environmentally sensitive riparian zones will no longer apply, and public access to the lands will be reduced</li> <li>• The loss of potential parklands acquisition, continued waterfront access, public access to the lands for recreational purposes, acquisition, or other fully equivalent protection, of ungulate winter range and</li> </ul>	

<b>Written comments [Castlegar] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>	<b>Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made</b>
<p>community watersheds and other similar public benefits resulting from the deletion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest workers and forest-based communities will suffer, since the deletion will cause forest industry job losses and associated effects on communities because it will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ reduce the Annual Allowable Cut on the TFLs and reduce regional timber supplies,</li> <li>○ allow the conversion of productive forest land to residential, non-forestry uses, and</li> <li>○ ultimately remove the restriction on the export from Canada of unmanufactured forest products (“raw logs”) from the lands</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Among other things, this failure to secure land and resource access may ultimately result in the Province incurring future litigation expenses. As is demonstrated below, there is a clear and compelling need for this transaction to be examined. An examination is necessary to determine if the public interest was served by the agreement to remove the TFL lands without obtaining compensation for the public—and, if not, how the situation may be rectified</li> <li>• First Nations’ interests are compromised because government failed to obtain proper compensation that could have supplemented the scarce supply of land and resources available to be used as part of the treaty process with First Nations, or to otherwise accommodate Aboriginal rights and title</li> </ul>	



<b>Written comments [Castlegar]</b>	<b>Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>	<b>Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made</b>
	<p>As a 2004 government briefing note (the “Briefing Note”) on the issue has noted-<i>The government and the landowner made a contract decades ago to manage the [TFL] land as if it were public; deletion undoes that contract. Since the initial contract involved Consideration – the award by government to the landowner of timber rights on Crown land –it would seem that the landowner should be able to buy out of that contract by providing appropriate consideration in return.</i></p> <p>As Commissioner David Perry stated when considering proposals to delete private land from TFLs held by MacMillan Bloedel in the late 1990s: <i>Because Schedule A land [which includes all the private land in a TFL] is highly regulated by the Crown, it is equivalent to Crown land. While within the Tree Farm License, MB’s [MacMillan Bloedel’s] land cannot be alienated to third parties, cannot be used for nonforestry purposes and can only be logged according to the prescriptions of the Forest Practices Code. Accordingly, the Schedule A land is a form of quasi Crown land rather than simply a regulated type of private land.</i></p>	
<p>“Marvin’s Small Motor Repair”</p>	<p>The TFL is part of our heritage, it belongs to the people of BC and the Minister is supposed to be looking after these lands for us. In allowing Pope and Talbot to take these lands out of the TFL and sell them and then pay their American creditors, the Minister is taking away our</p>	<p>The TFL belongs to the people of BC, therefore, if the Minister allows Pope and Talbot to remove their "private" lands, the monies should stay in BC</p>

<b>Written comments [Castlegar] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made</b>
	resources, our jobs, our heritage. We the people of BC should not be held accountable for the fact that Pope and Talbot could not manage their business properly. The TFL belongs to the people of BC, therefore, if the Minister allows Pope and Talbot to remove their "private" lands, the monies should stay in BC	
Paul Rodrigues	<p>I would like to express that I am not in favor of letting Pope and Talbot sell these lands.</p> <p>This is or was a greed filled corporation with no moral standards. Letting them sell off Canadian land to pay American Creditors is only a further slap in our faces.</p> <p>These lands are vital to our renewable lumber industry, as well as the well being of the interior communities they are around.</p> <p>With the removal of approximately thirteen thousand cubic meters of allowable cut, [if these properties are removed], more of any long term benefits from the logging industry are lost when the forestry sector recovers from this disastrous downturn.</p>	
Jack Padmoroff	Our community needs all the help it can get in these hard times. Private lands must stay with the TFL.	
Paramjit Gill		<p>This land belongs to the people of BC. It should not be sold</p> <p>We should have a public hearing</p>

<b>Written comments [Castlegar] Key concerns raised or statements made.</b>		<b>Solution: Suggestions or recommendations made</b>
Len and Nancy Donald		Large companies should not be allowed to sell our forest land, especially if the money goes to a foreign country [USA]
Bill Fuggra, Nelson	I say no to withdrawing lands from TFL 23. I would like to know how a private American firm has the audacity to sell public lands in a Canadian province	
Willy Gretchin	Withdrawal of private lands benefits few. A TFL is used for people's livelihoods and communities which serve many.	
Bill Dinner		The TFL should be held intact for current and future jobs and not for rich developers to cater to waterfront property owners
Croften Booth	It sets a bad precedent to allow Pope and Talbot to sell its timber rights to help pay off their debt....a debt resulting from bad business practices	

## Summary of key suggestions and recommendations

1. The criteria the Minister should use when considering removal of private land from a TFL are:
  - a. Removal of these private lands must have a real benefit to the people of BC especially the local communities and local industry including
    - i. compensation for decades of net benefit to the TFL holder
    - ii. continued public access to valued sites
    - iii. local economic benefits [for example from less log export]
    - iv. protecting heritage values such as the historic town of Arrowhead
  - b. Removal of these lands must be better for the environment. For example:
    - i. better forest management
    - ii. protection of important wildlife values
    - iii. reducing the carbon footprint
  - c. The original contract must be respected. It made provision for the removal of private land if required for a higher economic use than raising forest crops. However paying US creditors is not a higher economic use..
  - d. There must be adequate process? To date it has been inadequate. For example the general public needs:
    - i. more information
    - ii. more time to react to this proposed removal of private land
    - iii. more time to craft ‘win-win’ deals [for example time to access foundation funds or approach Columbia Basin Trust for purchasing of private lands].
    - iv. a redesigned process to remove bias favoring big developers and put more properties within reach of the general public.
    - v. to review options before they are presented to the Minister
2. Additional factors the Minister should consider before making his decision on the proposed removal of private land from TFL 23 are:
  - a. Do not remove private lands until the debt owed by Pope and Talbot to local contractors has been paid back
  - b. Do not remove private lands until the monies placed “in trust” with Pope and Talbot [the “surety deposits”] has been returned.
  - c. Do not remove private lands until the poor state of the local economy has been addressed [for example give more land to the Community Forest, use provincial “Community Development Funds” to help Nakusp in these hard times]

## Outstanding questions

At the meeting there was a commitment to find answers to some outstanding issues or questions and make them available on this website [www.for.gov.bc.ca/rsi](http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/rsi) until the end of August 2008.

These were

1. There is an assumption that the value of the private lands has gone up. Is there a capital gain on the increased value? If so, are these capital gains taxable?
2. What is the relationship of an approved Special Use Permit to private land? If there is a Special Use Permit on the private land can the private land be sold?
3. There is an uncertainty around the current Canadian Pacific Railway private lands [or private timber?]. What is the status of this issue and how does it relate to the removal of private lands?
4. Contractors for Pope and Talbot were asked to deposit some monies into a trust or something similar. What is the status of these monies? What can be done to return the deposit?
5. What is the potential for contractors to sue the officers of Pope and Talbot [if Pope and Talbot does not exist is there continued liability for the previous officers?].
6. Will the Ministry of Forests and Range take a look at the Creditors Act etc to see if there is any room to move on paying contractors?

## Appendix 1: Public Meeting details

### Goal of the Public Meetings

1. to take advantage of experts to address questions raised during the meeting
2. to record concerns and suggestions from the public

### Agenda for each Meeting

- Introduction by Mike Geisler [10 minutes]
- Presentations [20 minutes]
  - David Morel Executive Director, Ministry of Forests and Range
  - Ken Taylor, formerly Vice President Woodlands for Pope and Talbot and now temporarily with PricewaterhouseCoopers
- Questions and answers [60 minutes]
  - Audience was asked to state their names if they wanted their name recorded
  - The Questions & Answers were recorded by a note taker at the meeting
  - Audience was also asked to submit their views in writing to ensure no misinterpretations. Written submission are due June 15<sup>th</sup>]
- Informal discussions with experts after the formal part of the meeting closed. [30 minutes or so]

### Experts representing:

- Pope and Talbot: Ken Taylor
- Receiver [PricewaterhouseCoopers]; Janice Plumstead
- Ministry of Forests and Range:
  - Executive: David Morel, Executive Director
  - Executive Regional Director for the Southern Interior Region : represented by Frank Blom
  - District Managers
    - Revelstoke Meeting: David Raven
    - Nakusp Meeting : represented by Jim Guido
    - Castlegar Meeting : Larry Peitzsche
  - Resource Tenures and Engineering Branch : represented by Kelly Finck

### Displays and handouts available at meeting

- Detailed maps of each property requested to be removed from TFL 23 was posted on the walls of the meeting room
- The location of the website [[www.for.gov.bc.ca/rsi](http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/rsi)] where more background information could be found until the end of August 2008 was posted on the wall.
- There were three handouts available to everybody:
  1. two pages of 'Frequently asked Questions'
  2. a brochure style Information Fact Sheet describing TFLs in general and the removal process in particular
  3. Blank 'comment sheets' with directions on where to send them.